

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagamura et al. (US 6,292,239).

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda (US 5,929,950).

Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indication that claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claim 1, 7, 8, and 14, and canceled claims 6 and 13. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, 6 and 13 allegedly recite features that are “nonsensical.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, both recite features of claims 6 and 13 including “side portions of the hook plates face side portions of the hook protrusion.” Applicant respectfully submits that the term “face,” as now used in amended independent claims 1 and 8, is used as a verb to denote relative positioning of “side portions of the hook plates” and “side portions of the hook protrusion.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the language

incorporated into independent claims 1 and 8, which is commensurate with original claims 6 and 13, is definite as it recites a specific positional relationship between the hook plates and the hook protrusion. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1 and 8, which not recite the features of claims 6 and 13, comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, for at least the reasons set forth above, and respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagamura et al. (US 6,292,239), and claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda (US 5,929,950).

Applicant respectfully asserts that these rejections are rendered moot by the foregoing amendments to independent claims 1 and 8. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14 are now in clear condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: February 23, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000